



**Bureau of Land Management**

Boise District Office  
Bruneau Field Office  
3948 Development Ave  
Boise, ID 83705  
<http://www.id.blm.gov>

---

**Determination of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management

---

**A. BLM Office:** Bruneau Field Office

**NEPA Log Number:** DOI-BLM-ID-B020-2010-0024-DNA

**Lease/Serial Case File No.:**

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Crowbar Fire FP5T ESR/BAR Plan

**Location/Legal of Proposed Action:** T8S R5E & R6E; T9S R5E & R6E

**Applicant (if any):**

**Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

**Ground Seeding (S2) and Aerial Seeding (S3):** The proposal is to drill and aerial broadcast a perennial seed mixture comprised of native and non-native grasses, native forbs, shadscale, fourwing saltbush, and sagebrush. Aerial seeding of shrubs is proposed as an ES treatment to augment the development of vegetative structure across the burned landscape to further reduce sediment movement from wind and water erosion, which will aid in protecting habitat for springsnails, threatened bull trout, and sensitive redband trout. Reestablishing shrubs in the burned area would aid in restoring candidate sage-grouse habitat and for several sensitive species associated with sagebrush steppe habitat. The area was also important winter habitat for mule deer and antelope.

Drill seeding would occur over 27,169 acres and 28,650 aerial seeding would occur. Included in the acres of drill seeding is the creation of a 100 foot strip along well used roads within and bordering the fire perimeter that would be planted with forage kochia and Siberian crested wheatgrass to help prevent human caused ignitions from damaging ES efforts and act as fuel breaks for wildfires that may occur. These strips would help to protect BLM's ESR investment. A similar 100 foot strip composed of Siberian crested wheatgrass and Sandberg's bluegrass would be planted along the fire perimeter bordering the Horse Hill ACEC. The fire burned through 3,988 acres of the proposed Horse Hill ACEC. The ACEC was proposed to protect and enhance management of sensitive plant species.

These proposed actions meet the MFP objectives to: Provide for protection and conservation of rare and endangered plants within the planning unit (RM-5); Maintain and/or enhance unique or special habitats to retain and/or improve their character and value for wildlife, research, and human enjoyment. Protect habitats supporting nongame wildlife with high public and/or biological interest (WL-5); Maintain stability of 408,300 acres classified as moderate, high, and critical erosion hazard by reducing or minimizing wind and water erosion (WS-1); Protect and/or improve endangered species habitat within the BPU (WL-1); Manage 520,000 acres of sage-grouse range in the BPU to improve nesting, brood rearing, and winter habitats by: improving all poor and fair big sagebrush, meadow, and riparian ecological sites to good ecological condition (WL-4.4); Manage sensitive species habitat in the BPU to maintain or increase existing and potential populations (WL-2); Manage 1,079,000 acres of pronghorn habitat in the BPU, within IMP guidelines where applicable, to provide sufficient forage, water, cover, and space (WL-3.3); and Manage mule deer spring, summer, and fall, and winter range, and pronghorn habitat in the BPU to obtain good ecological condition, and to provide adequate food, cover, and water (WL-3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

**Erosion Control Structures (S6):** Strawbale and rock checkdams would be placed at approximately 80 - 105 locations in the headwater tributaries to Hot Creek and in the main channel of Hot Creek to reduce sediment movement downstream that could degrade habitat in the Bruneau River for the endangered springsnail. Sediment would also degrade habitat for threatened bull trout and sensitive redband trout. The proposed construction of catchments meets MFP objectives to: Protect and/or improve endangered species habitat within the BPU (WL-1); Manage sensitive species habitat in the BPU to maintain or increase existing and potential populations (WL-2); Maintain and/or enhance unique or special habitats to retain and/or improve their character and value for wildlife, research, and human enjoyment. Protect habitats supporting nongame wildlife with high public and/or biological interest (WL-5); Improve fisheries physical habitat to fair and good condition in 144 miles of stream and improve chemical water quality in 18 stream sites to tolerance levels for trout. Give special priority to improving habitat for red-band trout, a sensitive species (AWL-2); Protect and manage seasonal flows in perennial and intermittent streams to maintain aquatic/riparian habitat condition on 96 miles of stream in good condition. Give priority to habitat maintenance for red-band trout (AWL-3).

**Cultural Protection (S9):** Approximately three miles of fence would be constructed to protect Deer Water Spring cultural site. This site contains several pictographs and petroglyphs located in a small, deep and narrow, slot canyon section of Hot Creek. The site is located on the northern edge of the fire and the slot canyon is an effective trap for Russian thistle rolling across the landscape. The Russian thistle builds up in the slot canyon and when it burns, damage is caused to the ancient rock art. Fence would be constructed that would catch tumble weeds before they could become trapped next to the rock art and pose a threat for further damage from fire. This meets the MFP objective to: "Use all available means of physical protection to help preserve significant cultural sites", CRM-2.

**Livestock Closure (S12), Protective Fence/Cattle Guard (S7), and Fence Repair/Gate (R7):** Approximately 29 miles of protective fence would be constructed, 2 miles of fence



repair for protection, to exclude livestock from the treatment area during the seeding establishment closure period in the treated area of each of the five impacted allotments. Approximately 13 miles of interior fence would be repaired. Fencing of treatment areas is consistent with State leadership direction, which states the following: *“livestock will be excluded from the treatment area until monitoring results, documented in writing; show rehabilitation objectives have been met”* (H-1742-1). In case of treatment failure, other factors may need to be considered, such as natural recovery of untreated areas, and need or reason to continue closure.

**Noxious Weeds (S5/R5):** BLM policy requires that BLM control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands and eradicate them where possible and economically feasible.

**Monitoring Effectiveness of Treatments (S14):** Monitoring data would be collected from initiation of the proposed treatments through the year 2013.

**B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

LUP/Document <sup>1</sup>	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Bruneau Management Framework Plan (MFP)		1983
Boise District Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan		2004

<sup>1</sup>List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Management Framework Plans, or applicable amendments) and activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

OR

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

**C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action. List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).**

NEPA/Other Related Documents	Sections/Pages	Date Approved

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

- 1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis**

**area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial? Yes**

Documentation of answer and explanation: Multiple ESR plans with similar actions to those currently proposed have been completed in the same general area using the Bruneau Management Framework (MFP). The effects from the proposed actions would not differ from those described in the Boise District Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (2004).

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances? Yes**

Documentation of answer and explanation: Two alternatives have been proposed, the No Action alternative and the Proposed Action, which is similar to other ESR plans completed on the Boise District and the effects would be the same as those described in the Boise District Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (2004). The Proposed Action is an emergency response to reduce the potential degradation that could occur without the proposed treatment. The Proposed Action is being implemented to protect and/or restore habitat for endangered Bruneau hot springsnail, threatened bull trout, candidate greater sage-grouse, and several sensitive species. It would also help to reduce erosion and improve vegetation conditions across the burned area.

**3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (e.g., riparian proper functioning condition reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent USFWS lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action? Yes**

Documentation of answer and explanation: The ESR Plan used the most up-to-date information available in designing and creating the Proposed Action.

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document? Yes**

Documentation of answer and explanation: The effects resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action would be similar to those that have occurred with other ESR/BAR projects in the area and those analyzed in the MFP and the Boise District Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (2004).

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action? Yes**



Documentation of answer and explanation: The MFP and Boise District Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan were developed with public participation and input and appropriately reviewed by the public and agency.

**E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted**

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Barbara Chaney		US Fish and Wildlife Service

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

**F. Mitigation Measures:** List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures have been incorporated and implemented.

**G. Conclusion** *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*




Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

  
Preparer

10/16/10  
Date

  
NEPA Specialist

10/19/10  
Date

  
Bruneau Field Manager

10/19/10  
Date

**Note:** The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.